

*re* : THE RISE IN THE COLLEGE FEES

So far as the adjournment motions themselves are concerned, I would like to once again refer to the two notices *in extenso*. The notice of Hon'ble Members Sri Sivappa and Sri S. M. Krishna runs as follows: "To move 'that this House be adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, to wit, the situation arising out of the recent deaths of sixtytwo people at K. G. F. due to suspected poison in illicit intoxicant drinks.'" The notice of Hon'ble Member Sri Rajagopal is follows: "This House be adjourned to discuss the recent incident regarding the death of 62 persons between 15th and 18th instant in the K. G. F. area on account of consumption of poison in illicit liquor." In the first case, what is sought to be discussed is the situation arising out of the recent deaths of 62 people at K. G. F. due to suspected poison in illicit intoxicant drinks. The notice of the Hon'ble Member Sri Rajagopal wants to discuss a recent incident regarding the death of 62 persons. Before an adjournment motion can be admitted, it has to satisfy three conditions: firstly, it should be definite, secondly, it should be a matter of public importance, and thirdly, it should be urgent. So far as these two notices are concerned, there can be no doubt that it is a matter of public importance. Whether the number of deaths is 1 or 18 or 62, the incident itself would certainly be a matter of public importance. The notice must be held also to satisfy the requirement of definiteness. Though the actual number of deaths is subject of some difference and though the actual cause of death can only be definitely ascertained after the receipt of the Chemical Examiner's report, I am nonetheless inclined to hold that the two notices satisfy the requirement of definiteness.

The expression 'urgent' in relation to adjournment motions has two distinct connotations. Firstly, urgent means that it should be of recent occurrence and should be raised without delay. But this expression has also a second connotation and according to this, 'urgent' has been interpreted to mean that the subject should be such that the discussion would brook no

delay. This is because an adjournment motion will upset the pre-arranged programme of business and will have priority over business already put down for the day. The subject matter should be such that an immediate debate is called for and is essential. In the present case, I am afraid that it will be difficult to hold that the notices satisfy this requirement of urgency. As the statement of the Hon'ble Ministers made the other day discloses, all necessary steps have been taken by the Government to meet the so called situation. The deaths have already occurred and if there are any cases of people who have taken ill, even they will doubtless be receiving necessary medical aid. In any case, the two notices are limited only to the incident of death. This subject is not such that an immediate discussion is necessary to meet any particular situation that has arisen. A postponement of the debate is not likely to result in a failure to meet any situation of emergency. No such emergency necessitating an immediate discussion appears from the two notices. On the other hand, since the full facts are not before us and even the cause of death cannot be definitely known until the report of the Chemical Examiner is received, one can safely say that the debate, if allowed to take place now, would be premature and not based on ascertained and settled facts. On this ground therefore, I have to refuse consent to move them.

---

**STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION.**

*re* : THE RISE IN THE COLLEGE FEES

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—Sir, consequent on the formation of the New Mysore State on 1-11-1956 the question of affiliation of colleges.....

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—On a point of order, Sir. This subject of increase in college fees is one of the subject matters of the no-confidence motion we have given notice of against this Ministry for its failure to respond to the call of the students. Our no-confidence motion has been admitted by

(SRI S. SIVAPPA)

the Speaker for discussion and that discussion is to take place within a short period of one or two days. In the meanwhile, is it proper on the part of a Minister or anybody on behalf of Government to reply to that subject matter which has been admitted by the House for discussion on a motion of no-confidence in the Ministry? Any statement by any Minister should be allowed to be made only after the discussion of that subject matter on the motion of no-confidence in the Ministry.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Could the Hon'ble Member tell me under what rule he is raising this point of order?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—It may not strictly come under any particular rule, but these rules we have made are only for our guidance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does he want me to think that he is not relying upon any rule among the rules of procedure?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The motion of no-confidence against the Ministry has been admitted for discussion according to the Rules. One of the most important subjects for discussion in this motion is the increase in college fees. I am censuring this Government for that. Because the no-confidence motion has been admitted for discussion, they are now seeking to make a statement about this subject before the discussion. Is it proper on the part of the Minister to refer to that when a motion for that is pending before the House for discussion?

Sri S. RAJAGOPAL (K. G. F.).—Sir, my adjournment motion regarding deaths in K.G.F. has been rejected by you. Anyhow, it is not a happy thing for me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot make everybody happy.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—Please first of all dispose of the point of order raised by the Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition and then take up the point raised by the Hon'ble Member Sri Rajagopal.

Sri A. KRISHNASHETTY.—Sir is it another point of order that the Hon'ble Member Sri Muckannappa is raising?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not want anybody to tell me anything.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—Sir,...

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not a matter of right for the Hon'ble Member to speak.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—With due respect to the chair,.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I won't allow him to speak. Order, order. When I make a request and if he does not know how to respect it, I know how to implement it.

Here is a letter addressed on the 19th September by one of the Hon'ble Members:—

"Sir, kindly permit me to a point after the question hour is over about the promise made by the Government in regard to the fee rise in the colleges and the hardship caused and let me know the decision of the Government in this behalf either tomorrow or the day after."

I believe the Hon'ble the Chief Minister said that he would be making a statement on it. Members were pressing him to make it. Therefore, in response to that request, the Education Minister is making this statement. Apart from that, I am unable to uphold the contention that, when an adjournment motion is tabled Government is precluded from mentioning it. Nor can such a statement prejudice the rights or merits or demerits of the no-confidence motion.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If I find later on that Sri Lakkappa is unnecessarily disturbing, I will take appropriate action. What is his point of order?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, before you hear him, you are saying that you will take appropriate action. That will make us afraid. It is rather an unhappy thing.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am also very happy about it. When the Minister attempts to make a statement, the third point of order comes. If there

is anything serious, I can understand. Simply because the Hon'ble Member has got the right to say, "I have got a point of order," to put it to improper use is something which I want to prevent, if possible.

**Sri S. RAJAGOPAL.**—Sir, my adjournment motion regarding deaths in K.G.F. has been ruled out by you. The Government has said that the number of deaths is 18. That is wrong. I have placed before this House that the number is 62. The Chair asked me to furnish details and I have come with those details and I thought that before reading your ruling you would ask for that information. You have not done that, Sir. I do not know what purpose it will serve.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—What do you think is the purpose? You are suggesting that there is something wrong in it.

**Sri S. RAJAGOPAL.**—I am not suggesting that. I told you at the outset that I was not happy about it.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I have answered it and the Hon'ble Member must not raise it again and say that he is not happy.

**Sri S. RAJAGOPAL.**—The report given by the Government is not correct. I am convinced that the number of deaths is 62. Even the local Congress leader is convinced that it goes up to 100. So, the Government should at least appoint a committee consisting of the members of this House to go into this affair to find out whether the number of deaths is 18 or 62 or whatever it is. It is a very grave matter of public importance. In view of this, I am not in accord with your ruling and I protest against it and walk out.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The Hon'ble Member cannot go when I am on my legs. (Many members were standing) Every member must resume his seat. You must not protest against a ruling like that. It is contempt. If you have done it without knowing what it is, I will excuse you but note it for the future. Your point of order is that you want the Government to appoint a committee. That is not a point of order. Your unhappiness makes you feel like that and speak like that.

**Sri A. KRISHNA SHETTY** (Mangalore-II).—I have a statement to make.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I am not prepared to hear. Let the Minister make the statement and after that if there is anything which he wants to say I will hear him.

† **Sri S. R. KANTHI** (Minister for Education).—Sir, consequent on the formation of the New Mysore State on 1st November 1956, the question of affiliation of Colleges in the various integrated areas of the New State with the two Universities in the State, viz., the Mysore University and the Karnatak University, arose. The Arts and Science Colleges in the integrated areas of Madras Karnatak (South Kanara) and Coorg were allowed affiliation to the Mysore University, while those in Hyderabad-Karnatak area were allowed affiliation to the Karnatak University. The rates of fees laid down by the Karnatak University for the different courses in its area were made applicable to the Government Colleges in the Hyderabad-Karnatak area and the structure of fees in that University area is uniform and there is no variation. While in the case of Mysore University Area there was no uniform structure of fees and there was a wide variation in the rates of fees levied by the Colleges in the ex-Mysore area and those in the integrated areas of Coorg and South Kanara even though the Colleges in all these areas are affiliated to one and the same University, viz., the Mysore University. The enclosed statement gives the rates of fees levied previously and the revised ones.

In the Mysore University area, the fees charged in Government Colleges in the ex-Mysore were the lowest as compared to those charged in Government Colleges in the Coorg and Madras Karnatak area and other areas of the new State as indicated in the enclosed statements. Besides, there were representations from the Madras Karnatak and Coorg areas against charging higher rates of fees in those Colleges. It was also alleged therein that there was discrimination in the

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

matter of levy of fees in Government Colleges affiliated to the same University, viz., the Mysore University. It was felt that if a writ petition on this ground was moved before the High Court, the question of discrimination would arise. In order to have uniformity and to eliminate the feeling of discrimination, it was decided to have a uniform fee structure in the Government Colleges affiliated to the Mysore University as is the case in the Karnatak University. The question of fees was taken up for consideration after 24th June 1960 after the Colleges were taken over by Government from the Mysore University. The Finance Department had repeatedly suggested the raising of College fee at least to the level of that in Madras.

The Resources and Economy Committee appointed by Government which had gone into the question of fees levied in Government Educational Institutions has also recommended the enhancement of fees in Government Colleges to the level of those existing in the Madras State. The question was also considered by the representatives of the Mysore University, the Finance and Education Departments and the Directorate of Collegiate Education and it was agreed by them that the scales of tuition fees in the Colleges in the ex-Mysore area should be enhanced to the level of those existing in Madras State, which are in vogue in Colleges at Mercara and Mangalore.

The increase in Government commitments at Secondary and Collegiate Education level as already stated above and the Finance Department note in the matter urging for the rise in the fees and also the above recommendations of the committee led Government to enhance the scales of tuition fees in the Government Colleges in ex-Mysore area to the level of those existing in Colleges in Coorg and Madras Karnatak areas, as indicated in Government Order Nos. ED 112 UGG 60, dated 11th May 1962 and 6th July 1962. These scales of fees are more or less on par with the scales of fees now in

force in Andhra Pradesh and Madras States.

The Mysore University has also enhanced the rates of tuition fees in its constituent colleges to the level of fees as approved in Government Colleges from the current academic year. This has been followed by the Affiliated Colleges.

After careful consideration, Government have decided as a concession this year that the students whose parents' annual income is Rs. 3,600 and below Rs. 3,600 be given 50 per cent reduction this year of the enhanced fees and the enhanced rate be enforced from next year in respect of this category of students. Further, this concession will not apply to students whose parents annual income exceeds Rs.3,600.

As per the recent orders, the students whose parents' income is less than Rs. 2,400 are eligible for applying for freeship, half freeship and scholarship concessions. The implications and effect of the aforesaid Cabinet decision is that students whose parents annual income is Rs. 3,600 or less will have to pay only 50 per cent of the present enhanced fees this year only and those students whose parents' income is more than Rs. 3,600 will pay the enhanced fees.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A request has been made that the statement might be translated into Kannada and copies made available to the Members.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—What are the compelling reasons that prompted the Hon'ble Education Minister to make such a statement on the floor of the House in view of the fact that a specific allegation has been made in the No-confidence motion that has been moved and admitted?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—You have already read the letter.

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—It is the same statement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not for me to help anybody.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಈಗ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಅಂಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಯಮ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲರ್‌ಗಳೂ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದರು.



ಅಲ್ಲ ಎವರವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುವ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಯೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತಮ್ಮಿಂದ ಬಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಬಂದಿತ್ತೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದೆವು. ಆದರೆ, ಈಗ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಬರೀ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಕಡತವಾಗಿದೆ! ಇದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದ, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡುವ ವೇದಿಕೆಯಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿತ್ತೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದೆವು! ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿದಿನವೂ ನಡೆಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಚರ್ಚೆಯೇ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will tell you. If you protest against the Ruling and then say 'I go out', I have already informed the members including yourself that it will amount to contempt of the Chair. If you want to do anything else, it is open to you.

Sri A. KRISHNA SHETTY.—I shall go out on this question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You may go out. But, if you protest against the Ruling, I will not permit it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಂದ ಹೊರಟು ಹೋದರೆ, ಅದು 'Contempt' ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೂ ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಧ-ಇವತ್ತು ವಿದ್ಯಾಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿರುವ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಂಠಿಯವರ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ರೂಲಿಂಗಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಹತ್ತಾರು ಸಲ 'ವಾಕ್ ಬಿಟ್' ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರು ಅದು contempt ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ರೀತಿ ಎಲ್ಲದೆ! ನಾನು ಇರುವ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನು ಓದಿದ್ದೇನೆ—ಎಲ್ಲದೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ appraise ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The correct position is that when the Ruling is given by the Chair if anybody protests against the Ruling and walks out, it is contempt of the Chair. I have made it clear when I was the Speaker myself. But the thing is that, in democracy we have not taken notice of it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It amounts to contempt and I have no hesitation in my mind about it. There is no form, no book, on convention, no rule, which says that a Member can get up and say after the Ruling is over, "I protest against it" as if there is an appellate authority.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ 6 ವರ್ಷದಿಂದಿದ್ದರೂ ನಮಗಿದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲ! ನಮ್ಮ ಕಷ್ಟ ಇದು. ಅವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ

veil (ಮುಸುಕು) ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಆದರೂ, ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಆದರೆ ಅವರ ಗತಿಯೇನು! ಇಲ್ಲಯವರೆಗೆ ತಾವು ಯಾವತ್ತು ಹೀಗೆ walk-out ಮಾಡಿದರೆ contempt ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಗುರುಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲ! The Chair says that nobody should protest against the Ruling of the Chair and stage a walk-out as it will amount to contempt. This has happened in the same House more than a dozen times. We were not aware that it would amount to contempt. That is why I am very vehemently putting before the Chair what exactly is the course of action to be followed when the Members from this side or that side of the House are dis-satisfied with the ruling given by the Chair.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಕಂಠಿ.—ತಾವು 'Convenient' ಎಂದು.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನಮ್ಮ 'Convenience' ನೋಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಎಲ್ಲಾದರೂ, ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ರೂಲಿಂಗಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ 'Contempt' ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹಿಂದೆ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೃಷ್ಣಶೆಟ್ಟರು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಅವರು ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ Contempt ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಕೈಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಕೂಡದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, this is a matter the like of which happens repeatedly. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I want to make the position very clear. The Hon'ble Minister for Education, who was also the Speaker, has made his position very clear. He said that he had always held that a protest against the Ruling given by the Chair amounted to contempt. Otherwise, we cannot go on and if everybody thinks "I am not happy over the ruling, and therefore I protest and walk-out in protest", it is not only contempt of the Chair, but contempt of the whole House. It is the dignity of the House that is to be maintained. I think I made it clear to Sri Rajagopal that if he was protesting in walking out, I would not permit him and that too when I was on my legs.

(MR. SPEAKER)

I have, further told him that to protest and stage a walk-out in protest will amount to contempt of the Chair and he was good enough to resume his seat and the Hon'ble Member Sri Krishna Shetty should by that time have known what the position is. The Hon'ble Member Sri Mukkannappa, who has had a long parliamentary career should know what contempt of the House is. I have no doubt he knows about it, but still he wanted to appraise me and educate my mind saying that democracy has changed. It is entirely wrong. The Members will kindly bear hereafter that if there is anything they can tell me about it and I am prepared to hear. If you say "I protest against it and stage a walk-out," it is not benefitting the dignity of the House. I cannot permit the dignity of the House to be treated like that.

2-30 P.M.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I submit, Sir, that the adjournment motion has been disallowed and we will leave it at that stage. But we request the Chair to direct the Minister concerned to make a statement about the deaths that occurred in Kolar.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Soon after the report is received. The report of the Chemical Examiner has to be received.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ (ಭಾಲ್ಕಿ).— 19 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಗದ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅವರ ಹೆಸರೇನು ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Muckannappa is the member.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು).— ಕಾಗದ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರ ಹೆಸರೇನು, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Put a short notice question or anything else.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಹೇಪರ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿ ಫಿಗರ್ಸ್, ನರ್ಕಾರದವರು 72 ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಜಗೋಪಾಲ್ ಅವರು 65 ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದು ಸಜ್ಜ ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Leader of the Opposition, who moved the motion said that he was satisfied and that it was to his advantage. Now you are finding fault.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—That is about the fee rise statement.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—It is not concerned with the K.G.F. area.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not allowing.....

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I wish to clarify my position. Regarding the K.G.F. affair, you were pleased to say in your ruling—I am not going to question the ruling and we always keep the Chair above everything else—that it was a matter of public importance. But the Hon'ble Minister for Home and the Hon'ble Minister for Law made it emphatically clear that it was not a matter of public importance.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not agreed with them.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Now I request the Hon'ble Speaker to direct the Minister for Home and the Minister for Law to make a statement giving the correct details of the position. This affair has created a sensation in the whole of the State. It should have been discussed, but for various reasons you gave a ruling. I would request you, Sir, to direct the concerned Minister to make a statement and state the exact number of deaths, and the details. He must take the House into confidence. He cannot make a statement that the matter is not of public importance and get away. You have said that it is of public importance. I am not going to question your ruling. Even Sri Krishna Shetty did not protest against your ruling. But to show the depth of his feeling in the matter, he acted that way. You, Sir, should pull the Hon'ble Ministers and ask them to make a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Can I direct them? Is it an executive order?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—They think they can just escape and go away. None of them are here.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL (Coondapur).—Sir, we have heard a long statement from the Hon'ble Minister for Education. I wanted a clarification on that point. But by that time other things came up. I want to know from Government whether this concession

applies to the students of the integrated areas also.

**Sri B. D. JATTI** (Minister for Finance).—Sir, the discussion was over and another subject was taken for discussion. How can we go back, Sir?

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA**.—After the reading of the statement, a point of order and so many other things cropped up. I too wanted a clarification. By that time he ran away.

3,600 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಆದಾಯ ಕಡಮೆ ಇರುವವರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಹುಡುಗರಿಗೆ ಫೀಷಿಪ್ ಮತ್ತು ಹಾಫ್ ಫೀಷಿಪ್ಗಳು ತಲುಪಲೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಹುಡುಗರಿಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿತರಿಸಲಾಗದೆ ಇದೆ. ವಿತರಿಸಲಾಗದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಕೆಲವಾರು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿದ್ಯಾಪುಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅಷ್ಟರೊಳಗೆ ಹೊರಟುಹೋದರು. ಇನ್ನು ನಾನೇನು ಕೇಳಲಿ!

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—Both these points, I will try to attend to. One thing is certain. On the date when the No-confidence motion is going to be discussed, which is not far away, this matter is bound to be clarified beyond any shadow of doubt.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ**.—ಈಗ ಪಿ.ಯು.ಸಿ. ಗೆ 18 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು, ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿಗೆ 23 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು, ಹೀಗೆ ಹುಡುಗರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಫೀಸನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ದಿನೆಂಬರವರೆಗೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಡಿಸೈಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಬೇರೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಾರ್ಲೆಜು ಪ್ರಿನ್ಸಿಪಾಲ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿದರೆ, ಅವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಹುಡುಗರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿಯನ್ನಾದರೂ ಜಾಗೃತ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿ, ಅದನ್ನಾದರೂ ಕಾರ್ಲೆಜುಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನನಗೆ ಅನುಮಾನವಾಗಿದೆ.

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—Two days—are they going to change matters?

**ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ**.—ವಿದ್ಯಾಪುಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೂ ವಾಮನಮೂರ್ತಿಗಳಂತೆ ಇರುವ ದ್ರವ್ಯಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇನಾದರೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಬ್ಬಿಣದ ಬೀರುವಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಫೈಲನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಕುಳಿತರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು?

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—All right. I will consider.

## The Mysore Agricultural Income-tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1962.

*Motion to consider.*

(Debate Continued)

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—So far as this Bill is concerned, I had mentioned to the House that 3½ hours were allotted. Out of that how much has been spent? I think we discussed the Bill sometime on Friday and Saturday.

**Sri B. D. JATTI**.—According to my information, we have discussed for one-and-a-half hours.

**Sri GANGADHAR NAMOSHI** (Gulbarga).—I wish to submit...

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—Is it really important?

**Sri GANGADHAR NAMOSHI**.—It is very important, Sir.

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—I cannot permit....

**Sri GANGADHAR NAMOSHI**.—Sir, you have already promised on the floor of the Assembly that it is a non-official day and the Karnataka resolution will be taken up. Now you have mentioned the No-Confidence motion. For that reason, I want a clarification from the Chair.

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—I have told the Hon'ble Members several times to note what is in the agenda. If they want to raise a matter, they must tell me previously. Why has the Hon'ble member forgotten that?

**Sri GANGADHAR NAMOSHI**.—It was decided on the floor of the House last time...

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—What did I say? Is it in today's agenda? Kindly read the whole agenda and tell me. Please do not raise anything which is not there. Without previously telling me and taking my permission, why should you raise any topic?

**ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ**.—ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಯೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ, ತಮಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾವು 200 ಜನರೂ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಕಾಫಿ ತಂದುಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಯೇ ಹೇಳಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಹೇಳಿಬಿಡಿ.

**Mr. SPEAKER**.—I will give every member two cups, which will come to  $200 \times 2 = 400$ .